DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 434 078 SO 031 258

AUTHOR Sorenson, Georgia; Adams, Bruce; Kretman, Kathy Postel; Linsky, Marty; Burns, John S.; Gmelch, Walter H.; Kellerman, Barbara; Rost, Joseph C.

TITLE Democracy at Risk: How Schools Can Lead.

INSTITUTION Maryland Univ., College Park. Center for Political Leadership and Participation.; Harvard Univ., Cambridge, MA. Kennedy School of Government.; Washington State Univ., Pullman. Dept. of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology.

SPONS AGENCY Department of Education, Washington, DC.

PUB DATE 1996-05-00

NOTE 28p.; Prepared by the Eisenhower Leadership Group.

AVAILABLE FROM The Center for Political Leadership & Participation, The University of Maryland, College Park, Maryland 20742-7715; Tel: 301-405-5751; e-mail: <cplp@umail.umd.edu>.

PUB TYPE Guides - Non-Classroom (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS Citizenship Education; Citizenship Responsibility; Democracy; *Democratic Values; Elementary Secondary Education; *Leadership Training; Social Studies; Social Values

IDENTIFIERS *Eisenhower Leadership Program

ABSTRACT

This report describes the Eisenhower Leadership Program, an approach to leadership learning that aims to educate students for democracy. Based on the premise that democracy at risk threatens the fabric of the national culture, the document presents five key elements considered essential for educating students to become democratic leaders. These elements are as follows: (1) establish a democratic environment in the school and classrooms; (2) engage students in critical thinking regarding problems they are asked to address; (3) make leadership learning a collaborative effort; (4) involve students in real learning experiences and situations outside the classroom; and (5) allow time and space for reflection. Recommendations for attaining these goals are provided via models enacted by participating Eisenhower Leadership Program schools. Appendices list in-place Eisenhower Leadership Program Projects, persons interviewed for this report, and 23 suggested readings. (MM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SO

ED 434 078

DEMOCRACY AT RISK:

How Schools Can Lead

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

SO 031 258

Eisenhower Leadership Group

May 1996

DEMOCRACY AT RISK:
How Schools Can Lead

Eisenhower Leadership Group

Georgia Sorenson
Bruce Adams
Kathy Postel Kretman
Center for Political Leadership & Participation
University of Maryland

Marty Linsky
Leadership Education Project (Ronald A. Heifetz, Director)
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

John S. Burns
Walter H. Gmelch
Department of Educational Leadership and
Counseling Psychology
Washington State University

Barbara Kellerman
Joseph C. Rost
Project Consultants

May 1996

"I believe that somehow every student in every college of the United States ought to be taught fundamental lessons that say democracy is precious, democracy is perishable, democracy requires active attention and that democracy requires hard work."

-Roger Wilkins
Robinson Professor of History and American Culture
George Mason University
"Are We Taking Care of Our Democracy?"
University of Maryland, March 7, 1996

CONTENTS

Democracy at Risk: How Schools Can Lead

What Is The Problem? 1

What Is To Be Done? 2

How Can It Work? 5

What Do We Do? 7

Summing Up 11

A Word After by Georgia Sorenson 13

Appendix 1: 15
Eisenhower Leadership Development Program Projects

Appendix 2: 19
People Interviewed By Members of the Eisenhower Leadership Group

Appendix 3: 21
Suggested Readings

DEMOCRACY AT RISK:
How Schools Can Lead

Every democracy requires a large number of citizens willing and able to make a difference. One place we learn to participate is in our schools. Schools powerfully affect how we learn, what we learn, and whether -- throughout our lives -- we are willing to meet the challenge of civic engagement.

This report describes a new approach to leadership learning that enables schools at every level to educate citizens for democracy. The Eisenhower Leadership Program uses a twenty-first century model of leadership to engage young people. This collaborative and participatory approach to leadership motivates students to be interested in and capable of doing the work of creating change. In the next millennium it is this capacity that will be key to progress -- in the workplace as well as the nation at large.

What Is The Problem?

American democracy is at risk. Too many of us -- either from complacency or despair, inertia or ignorance -- are leaving the work of civic engagement to others. Too many of us are expecting someone else to carry all the water.

The upshot? A democracy in which too few people do the public business, leaving the many disengaged and disenchanted.

Signs of trouble are everywhere: in the overall downward trend in voter turnout and the upward trend in drug use; in the apparent indifference of those in power to the growing gap between rich and poor and to the endangered middle class; in the declining level of civic participation and the rising levels of cynicism and distrust; in the explosion of lobbyists who declare self-interest a virtue; and in the attraction of isolationism even in an inevitably globalized economy.

Too many of us are expecting someone else to carry all the water.

We see it in the messengers, a press increasingly perceived as cynical and out of touch with common concerns. We see it in our students who appear less interested in politics than were their predecessors. Finally, our democracy is mirrored in our politics -- a game now fueled by money and a political climate polluted by high levels of hostility and indifference.

One sign of this disengagement is the yearning by some for a savior, a heroic leader who, however untested or inex-

perienced, can lead us to the promised land, and fix what's broken without even asking us to lend a hand.

Perhaps this impulse reflects the impression that we lack power and cannot affect change. Certainly polls testify to the widely held belief that nothing we do makes much difference. As a consequence, democracy threatens to become a spectator sport.

We must change the way people in this country understand democracy.

"All over the country and in every culture, everybody is bemoaning the fact that we don't have visionary leadership," says Wilma Mankiller, Chief of the Cherokee Nation. "Everybody says there's a vacuum of leadership. I contend that no prophet is going to come along and save America. Visionary leadership is going to come along in little tiny places all over the nation, and everyone is responsible for providing it."

We seem to forget how democracy works. It will wilt if we merely observe and flourish only if we participate. We seem to have lost our appreciation for the art and science of power. No one better understood the importance of power than those who made the American Revolution. People power is a recurring theme in the American experience. But in the last few decades too many of us have surrendered power to those in positions of authority and failed to assert the right to compel change when change became necessary. We have neglected our heritage and hopes -- a government for and by the people.

We must do more than just reverse this trend. We must change the way people in this country understand democracy. We need more -- many more -- citizens who grasp the nature of power and who have the will and skill to exercise it. We need to recover our understanding that authority is a trust relationship. We understand the tensions here -- between those who have power now and those who stand to acquire it, between those with authority and those who give authority. In the interest of fostering democracy, these are tensions we encourage and even embrace.

What Is To Be Done?

Who are we to declare ourselves so bluntly on these matters? We -- the members of the Eisenhower Leadership Group -- are educators. As educators we hold to the tradition of education with a civic mission. We do not claim schools are the only place that can do this work. Indeed, we urge all institutions to work to strengthen democracy for twenty-first century America. But because so many traditional sources of socialization are under stress -- especially the family -- schools inevitably bear the major burden of teaching young people about democratic government, their responsibilities, and their rights.

Teaching About Democracy

Teaching about democracy is not a task at which schools have excelled. We propose to revitalize instruction on democracy by overturning both content and process. We propose the wholesale reinvention and reinvigoration of courses across the board -- from kindergarten

through college. We propose schools teach about leadership, power, and influence, and about how students can be agents of change even when they are young, and even if they lack formal authority.

To do this we must begin at the beginning: with a new kind of American history that is more than a mere parade of people and facts. Rather it is the tale of a nation that from its inception has been marked by contests for power.

Telling the Truth

The truth is that the United States of America always has had strife between those who have -- land, money, rights, authority, influence, power -- and those who do not. The truth is that the American experiment has always been riddled with tensions among groups competing with each other for some of, or more of, the American dream. The truth is that in all our struggles -- from the Revolution to the Civil War, from the battles for workers' rights to the civil rights movement -- there have been winners and losers. The truth is that this is the model of power -- the model of leadership -- to which we have been trained since the beginning of the Republic. But the truth is that this zero sum model of power is proving to be increasingly ineffective.

This dose of reality about American history must be accompanied by a dose of reality about what it takes to be an effective democratic citizen. Young Americans must learn how to have a voice in the public debate. They must learn about advocacy and ambiguity; about charisma and chaos; about group dynamics and conflict resolution; about individual and group responsibility; about stability and change; and about fairness.

We are not arguing that schools are unaware of the need to teach authentic democracy. We are claiming that in general they have not had a device, a hook if you will, on which to hang this particular hat. In short, schools at all levels have lacked a strategy for the kind of participatory education that teaches participatory politics.

Participating Is a Virtue -- But It's Not Easy

Participatory education is not new. Schools across the country are experimenting with various forms of service learning, volunteerism, and community involvement. Political scientist Benjamin Barber has done pioneering work in this regard at Rutgers University, developing a curriculum in which community service plays an integral part. Barber testifies that the service component serves two distinct, albeit related, purposes. First, it gives students a personal sense of empowerment, enabling them to do things they would not have been able to do otherwise. Second, it changes the classroom. That is, by getting involved, students become less cynical and detached, and more trusting, caring, and concerned. In turn, they become better learners of what higher education tries to impart. The State of Maryland now mandates a stu-

Young Americans must learn how to have a voice in the public debate.

Voices in Support of Experiential Learning

Ron Walters, Professor of Political Science, Howard University

"We've had this notion that all learning takes place in a cloistered environment, and that is wrong. We live in a different world and we have to try to connect education to the outside. We have to reconceptualize what we mean by academic experience."

Frances Moore Lappé, Center for Living Democracy

"How do we learn those particular skills that make democracy work? How do we elevate those skills to the highest level and the same level that we elevate the art of writing, the art of math, etc.? Experiential learning enhances the art of democracy. This is what can make all of education work, because in the end young people will be motivated, they will learn their academic subjects better if empowered to be real problem solvers in their lives."

Earl Smith, Dean of Social Sciences, Pacific Lutheran University

"The curriculum needs to be innovative, participatory, and progressively challenging. Internships and service learning must be wed with opportunities to relate theory to practice. Community service ought to be an integral part of the curriculum and a graduation requirement."

Robert Dahl, Emeritus Professor of Political Science, Yale University

"I don't think ten, eleven, and twelve year olds are too young to begin to learn how you participate in meetings with other people. I think an imaginative teacher and an imaginative instructional handbook could get them involved in meetings and teach them how to conduct themselves."

dent service requirement for high school graduation.

But for all the apparent interest and support by some, programs encouraging or even requiring students to participate in their own learning remain rare. The reasons are clear: They are politically and organizationally difficult to implement. Objections range from "you can't mandate service," to "students should be spending more time as it is on traditional academics," to "it is a nice idea but impossible to do." And so, despite glowing testimonials to the value and importance of participatory learning -- the kind of learning that prepares students for a lifetime of participatory politics -- such experiences remain at the periphery of American education.

How Can It Work?

The Eisenhower Leadership Program -- formally, the Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Development Program, a federally supported initiative under the Higher Education Act of 1965, as amended in 1992 -- has yielded a powerfully persuasive response to the question of how to do the experiential learning that is, simultaneously, a civic exercise. We in the Eisenhower Leadership Group do not claim it is the only answer, but it provides an important new approach to the pressing matter of making our schools hotbeds of democracy.

Thirty-eight colleges and universities across the nation received Eisenhower grants that enabled them to develop and implement courses or programs in Leadership Studies. The evidence testifies that learning leadership is possible; and that such learning yields other, originally unanticipated, benefits.

Learning about leadership, it turns out, is learning about democracy. We are talking about using leadership as a device for participatory learning. Leadership can be used to revive and reinvigorate courses throughout the curriculum. Leadership can engage students in their own education. Leadership can teach civic engagement. And we are talking about reconceiving leadership itself.

The Old Model of Leadership — and the New Model of Leadership

In the past, leadership discourse was concerned primarily with individual reputation and accomplishment. Leaders were special people who did special things. The rest were followers who, for reasons ranging from fear to convenience, went along with what the leader said and did.

Learning about leadership, it turns out, is learning about democracy.

By and large, scholars of leadership fed into the historical divide between leader and follower. Even now most books on leadership are about leaders, not followers or constituents, and the continuing high concentration of leadership programs in business and military schools strengthens the impression that such initiatives are mainly about producing top guns in business and government.

Arguably, this approach once worked, for if the industrial age was characterized by anything, it was by hierarchical organizations with leaders who were top executives, and everyone else was down below. It was an arrangement designed for the needs of its time -- efficient production and distribution.

Times have changed. We are in the information age, and we share a planet that, for all the still rampant strife, is shrinking. The rules of engagement that applied for most of what has been called "the American century" no longer work. In the next century, new ways of organizing ourselves, new ways of thinking about leadership, will be required.

Curiously, no single literature reflects the need for a new model of leadership more than the literature on leadership in business. We say "curiously" because we recognize that in the real world, private sector workers are still highly vulnerable to those on high. Jobs depend on decisions made at the top; in fact, job insecurity is the main reason schools make training for work their highest priority.

The act of creating change —of making something better than it was before— proves to students that participation matters.

In spite of the gap between theory and practice, most of those who write about private sector leadership agree on the following: that technology and globalization have changed the ways organizations work. In order to work well in the twenty-first century, organizations will have to be flattened. Leaders and followers are linked and must be involved in the leadership process. Also, teamwork and collaboration work better than command and control; management and leadership are qualitatively different; and an increasingly diverse workforce requires new ways of creating change.

This new model of leadership is collaborative, recognizing the value of authority and requiring widespread participation in collective decision-making. It accepts the inevitability of conflict, but encourages consensus. It concedes that in the end some will be more satisfied than others, but it searches for win-win solutions that allow positive change to take place.

This is not to say the new model of leadership diminishes the contribution of individuals. Rather it argues that any individual, located any place in the system, can play a leadership role. And it insists that whatever the dynamic of change, those who will be affected are those who should participate.

Learning About Leadership Is Learning About Democracy

In their monograph, *Educating Democracy: The Role of Systemic Leadership*, Gary Crow and Robert Slater address the shift in how we think about leadership. They write about how school leadership is changing "from an authoritative, hierarchical model to a decentralized, collaborative model." Their approach is systemic -- that is, they view the entire educational enterprise as one in which all units are linked, and they view leadership "as an interrelated system joined at all levels, with common purpose."

We build on the Crow-Slater approach -- and this is in keeping with our civic purpose -- by focusing primarily on the classroom. The Eisenhower Leadership Program provides evidence that to learn leadership -- the new model of leadership -- is to learn about democracy.

The new model of leadership insists on the participation that is the heart of the democratic enterprise. The new model of leadership confirms that to collaborate is to prepare for civic engagement. The new model of leadership empowers even those with few resources. The new model of leadership enables students to discover they are worthy and competent, and that because they are both they can make a difference. The new model of leadership provides teachers as well as students with a democratic experience.

The act of creating change -- of making something better than it was before -- proves to students that participation matters. Put another way, the act of engagement as realized through the act of leadership teaches democracy more effectively than any textbook. Getting students to be both leaders and collaborators is in and of itself an important educational experience. It also prepares them for a citizenship that is active rather than, merely, passive.

What Do We Do?

Sounds nice, but it sounds difficult. Where do we begin? How can we put into place the kind of leadership program that will do the work we are talking about?

First, let us list the five key elements of leadership learning:

1. Democratic Schools and Classrooms

Administrators set the tone and teachers play the music. Students should be immersed in an environment that is in every way conducive to educating for democracy. Teaching in particular should be a collaboration between teachers and learners. Students must be given responsibility for their own learning, and teachers must engage students in the kind of interaction that is the essence of the democratic experience.

2. Critical Thinking

The act of leadership depends on the idea of leadership. Before students leave the classoom to initiate change, they must learn what the new model of leadership implies; they must understand the problem they are trying to address; and they must have a grasp of what problem-solving in this particular circumstance might imply. In other words, before they are taught to act, they must be taught to think.

"We've had this nineteenth century notion that all learning takes place in a cloistered environment, and that is wrong."

-Ronald Walters,
Professor of Political Science,
Howard University

3. Collaboration

All leadership learning must be a collaborative effort -- between those who in a given circumstance are the leaders and those who in the same cir-

cumstance are the constituents. As we use the term, citizenship implies actively deciding on, and participating in, the change process. To collaborate means to do the work together, to undertake what can best be described as a team effort.

4. Experience

Leadership learning cannot be simulated. It must take place in part outside the classroom, in the so-called real world. It demands that students quit for the occasion what Ronald Walters of Howard University calls the "cloistered environment" of the schoolhouse, and that they find their own learning laboratory -- a factory, a hospital, an office, a social service agency.

5. Reflection

Like all learning, leadership training is absorbed into the bloodstream only when there is time and space to reflect on what actually happened. Since leadership as advocated here is a particular means to a particular end -- the lifetime learning of democracy -- this reexamination of the complexities and contradictions of democratic life is absolutely essential.

Now let's get specific. Here are some more detailed recommendations for using leadership to teach about democracy and change to students of all ages. The following list is not intended to be all-inclusive. Rather it is deliberately pegged to the five elements of leadership learning listed above. It is to provide teachers and administrators in elementary and middle schools, high schools and colleges with a few guidelines for introducing leadership into the curriculum. And it is to facilitate forging the experience of leadership into the experience of democracy. Each of the five recommendations is supported by two examples from the Eisenhower Leadership Program.

Recommendation # 1: Promote the New Model

The new model of leadership -- the twenty-first century model -- has three basic components: it is collaborative, inclusive, and change oriented. It can be done by anyone. Leadership is not the exclusive province of executive officers or political officials, or of teachers or administrators. It is about creating change, about making better in some way the group, organization, or community.

Eisenhower Leadership Project examples:

- University of California at Los Angeles. Professors Helen and Alexander Astin brought together leadership scholars from across the country to develop a new model of leadership for social change. The model is designed for the higher education community, but has important applications for any educational setting or profession. This value-based leadership development model is based on the assumption that the way leadership is conceived and practiced must be transformed to prepare a new generation of effective leaders for social change. Contact: Helen and Alexander Astin.
- John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University. Ronald Heifetz pioneered the

teaching of a new model of leadership to graduate students at the Kennedy School. Using the class itself as a leadership experience, Dr. Heifetz has trained thousands of mid-career professionals as well as recent graduates in the theory and techniques of exercising leadership -- both with and without authority. Contact: Ronald Heifetz.

Recommendation # 2: Cross Pollinate

In the twenty-first century, the largely arbitrary breakdown of knowledge into academic disciplines will be even more of a barrier to learning than it is now. From kindergarten through college the curriculum must become more integrated -- an effort in which leadership programs can show the way. Leadership learning provides a convenient vehicle for re-examining how knowledge in the age of information and globalization can best be conveyed. As students will experience for themselves, the real world does not break down neatly into categories. Their own experiential learning will both profit from and contribute to the integrated thinking that in the twenty-first century will be necessary for the educated individual -- as well as an important asset in the workplace.

Eisenhower Leadership Project examples:

- The Jepson School of Leadership Studies, University of Richmond. An interdisciplinary team of scholars was assembled to develop a program and curriculum to support an undergraduate minor and major in Leadership Studies. To prepare students for leadership in an increasingly diverse society, Jepson faculty collaborated closely with colleagues teaching courses on culture, gender, and race. Contact: Gill Hickman.
- Washington State University. The first undergraduate interdisciplinary minor in Leadership Studies at a comprehensive public university was established on the Washington State campus. Faculty from the following programs, departments, and schools were involved in an effort to integrate traditional disciplines with the emerging leadership literature: Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology, Department of Comparative American Cultures, Department of Management and Systems, Department of Political Science, Program in Women's Studies, and the Edward R. Murrow School of Communications. Contact: John S. Burns.

> *"We learn to build houses by building houses, play the harp by playing the harp, to be just by doing just acts."*
>
> -Aristotle

Recommendation # 3: Reach Out

Leadership learning can and should take place within the school, but it must also flourish on the outside. It is by now a commonplace that in the interest of children, schools should form partner-

ships -- with all kinds of partners. The success of this effort will depend on forging ties -- between schools and parents, schools and the community, schools and businesses, schools and other schools. We especially have been impressed by partnerships between high schools and colleges. All these collaborations are themselves a metaphor for the cooperative effort leadership learning now implies.

Eisenhower Leadership Project examples:

- The Center for Political Leadership and Participation of the University of Maryland and John F. Kennedy High School. The Center and Kennedy High School's Leadership Training Institute collaborated to create a leadership laboratory at the high school. The Center contributed a full-time faculty director who developed the leadership curriculum with JFK High School teachers. In addition, the Center provided JFK with faculty, speakers, leadership scholars, student mentors, and assistance with grant writing and interactive computing modules. In turn, JFK contributed to the project a learning laboratory, student interns, and opportunities for research for leadership scholars. JFK represents one of the best examples of outreach to the neighboring community, with an especially impressive student-to-student mentoring project to assist local middle and elementary school students. To date, more than 200 JFK students have participated in the Leadership Training Institute. Contact: Kathy Kretman, Center for Political Leadership & Participation, and Jeff Schultz, John F. Kennedy High School.
- St. Norbert College. The "Leadership for a New Millennium: Citizens of Change" program was developed by a leadership team of twenty-one undergraduate and graduate students, student life educators, and faculty. The purpose of the project was to create a replicable leadership and service program model that empowered and encouraged civic responsibility. The two-day experiential learning program gave participants an opportunity to learn a new view of leadership and to apply their new understanding with young children in summer day care projects throughout the city of Green Bay. More than 600 youth, 100 college students, and 100 educators were involved. Contact: Kathy Shellogg.

Recommendation # 4: Build Houses

We learn democracy by participating, and we learn to participate by making change. Aristotle said: "We learn to build houses by building houses, play the harp by playing the harp, to be just by doing just acts." When students practice civic participation and persuasion in real life situations in the community, leadership learning teaches precisely those skills and proclivities that make strong democratic citizens.

Eisenhower Leadership Project examples:

- Western Illinois University. The "Learning to Lead" program was created to train and motivate future Hispanic leaders to contribute to public policy and to serve as role models. After intensive leadership development training and field placements in the public policy arena, the college students had a chance to put their leadership learning to the test. When the first all-minority slate of student officers faced a group intent on dividing them and undermining their authority, the "Learning to Lead" participants met the challenge, and attributed their success to the leadership institute. Contact: Carol Fimmen.
- Howard University. The "Leadership Education and Development Program" (LEAD) is based upon the concept that the development of leadership requires both an academic understanding of leadership as well as exposure to a rich set of experiences where students understand the challenges of leaders and the skills necessary to operate effectively. Sixty-five juniors and seniors were exposed to the "culture of leadership" in government affairs, the private sector and the international arena. Students first participated in workshops given by decision-makers working in the three broad fields of endeavor, and then were placed in "mentor-protégé" relationships to observe the decision-makers in real life situations. Contact: Ronald Walters.

Recommendation # 5: Borrow Shamelessly

The Eisenhower Leadership Program has accumulated a rich store of materials on how programs using the twenty-first century model of leadership can be implemented in the nation's schools. Although most of the information pertains to projects in colleges, we believe that by providing examples that can as easily be modified as replicated, they speak to all educators at all levels of education. Our repository demonstrates that leadership programs can be introduced without great difficulty by dedicated faculty and administrators, and that they do not demand a large investment of organization or money. In other words, they are within reach of virtually every school in America. We encourage educators to contact us or the resource persons listed here to start your own search for a breakthrough approach to learning democracy.

Summing Up

The problem we identify at the outset of this report -- democracy at risk -- threatens the fabric of our national culture. Commentators on the right and left agree with David Broder of *The Washington Post* who wrote recently: "All the discussion points toward the restoration of social trust, civic institutions, and civil debate as the *sine qua non* of a healthy society."

The question we address is how this restoration can begin. This report provides our reply.

We recognize that schools must prepare students for the twenty-first century workforce. Our argument is that in order to do so they must also, simultaneously, prepare them for twenty-first century citizenship. The first simply cannot be accomplished without the second.

The Eisenhower Leadership Program provides a means to both ends. Leadership learning gives students the opportunity to practice democracy from an early age. It plants the seeds of the healthy society to which Americans have aspired since the beginning of the Republic.

A WORD AFTER

Georgia Sorenson, Ph.D.
Director, Center for Political Leadership & Participation
University of Maryland

The Eisenhower Leadership Group labored mightily from the fall of 1995 through the blizzards of 1996 and into the spring to make a strong statement about the need for our schools to take the lead in preparing students for their citizenship responsibilities. This report is based on our interviews with top scholars and practitioners, our assessment of the value of the 38 college and university projects funded by the federal Dwight D. Eisenhower Leadership Development Program, and from our own experiences as teachers.

Everyone interested in the future of our schools and, indeed, the future of our democracy should read this report. We have found that teaching about leadership empowers students and enlivens dead subjects. We believe that leadership learning can light the fire of democracy in a generation of students and reverse the trends toward apathy and disengagement. If policymakers and educators act on these recommendations, our schools and our communities will be better places to learn and live long into the next century.

My first thanks go to my colleagues at the University of Maryland at College Park (Bruce Adams, who served as the project director, and Kathy Postel Kretman), Harvard University (Marty Linsky), and Washington State University (John S. Burns and Walter H. Gmelch). These three universities received the grants from the federal Department of Education that made this report possible. My special thanks to Donald N. Bigelow, Director of the Eisenhower Leadership Development Program, and Richard Scarfo, Director of the Center for International Education of the Department of Education. Without their support, commitment, and prodding, there would be no report or, indeed, no projects. Scholars Barbara Kellerman and Joseph C. Rost worked with us on the project team, conducting many of the interviews and making important contributions to the substance of this report. Barbara Kellerman earned my special admiration for taking on the difficult job of pulling together the thoughts of this group of strong willed and committed educators and producing this report.

We are all grateful to the educators and students at the 38 Eisenhower projects whose vision and hard work have inspired and enlightened this report. We see in them the hope and the promise of brighter tomorrows that seem so absent from the political debate at the national level. We thank the scholars and practitioners who gave of their time and wisdom. And I thank several people on the staff of the Center for Political

Leadership & Participation at the University of Maryland who helped produce this final report -- Robin Gerber, Michele Giovannini, Nance Lucas, Victoria Navalaney, Bea Poulin, and Brooke Foster. Thanks also to Melonie Morgan of University Printing Services who designed the report. Two students from the John F. Kennedy High School Leadership Training Institute -- Dan Schultz and Peter Yeung -- were valuable contributors to this report. My thanks to them and to Institute Director Jeff Schultz for their help and for being an inspiration for all of us in the Eisenhower Leadership Group.

EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM PROJECTS

Appendix 1

ALASKA

Alaska Council of School Administrators, 326 4th Street, #404, Juneau, AK 99801
Project Director: Stephen T. McPhetre (907) 586-9702 FAX: (907) 586-5879

ARIZONA

Arizona State University, Educational Leadership, P.O. Box 872411, Tempe, AZ 85287-2411
Project Director: Grayson Noley (602) 965-4671 FAX: (602) 965-1880

CALIFORNIA

Fresno City College, 1101 E. University Ave., Fresno, CA 93741
Project Director: Robert Fox (209) 442-4600 FAX: (209) 485-7304

Santa Clara University, 500 El Camino Real, Santa Clara, CA 95053
Project Director: Lee Mahon (408) 554-4696 FAX: (408) 554-2392

University of California, Higher Education Research Institute,
UCLA Graduate School of Education, 3005 Moore Hall, P.O. Box 95121,
Los Angeles, CA 90045-1521
Project Director: Helen S. Astin (310) 825-1925 FAX: (310)206-2228

University of Southern California, Graduate School of Business Administration,
Leadership Institute, Bridge Hall 308-D, Los Angeles, CA 90089-1421
Project Director: Jay Conger (213) 740-4318 FAX: (213)740-0220
(Kathleen Reardon, former director)

COLORADO

Colorado Hispanic Institute, 1445 Market Street, Suite 280, Denver, CO 80202
Project Director: F.C. Luna (303) 620-4436 FAX: (303) 620-4440

University of Southern Colorado, Department of Community & Special Projects,
2200 Bonforte Boulevard, Pueblo, CO 81001
Project Director: Rose Duran (719) 549-2292 FAX: (719) 549-2765

CONNECTICUT

University of Connecticut, Sport, Leisure & Exercise Sciences, Box U-110, Storrs, CT 06269
Project Director: John G. Douglas (203) 486-3624 FAX: (203) 486-1123

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Howard University, Political Science Department,
2441 6th Street, NW, Room 144, Douglas Hall, Washington, DC 20059
Project Director: Ronald Walters (202) 806-5713 FAX: (202) 265-3527

FLORIDA

Florida Community College at Jacksonville
Kent Campus, 3939 Roosevelt Boulevard, Suite D104, Jacksonville, FL 32205
Project Director:
Kelly Nelson Warren (904) 381-3674 FAX: (904) 381-3462

Miami-Dade Community College, Wolfson Campus, 300 N.E. Second Ave., Miami, FL 33132
Project Director: Victoria Dimidjan (305) 237-3000 FAX: (305) 237-3796

University of Tampa, Center for Leadership, 401 W. Kennedy Blvd., Box 65F, Tampa, FL 33606
Project Director: Stephen A. Stumpf (813) 253-6271 FAX: (813) 258-7408

ILLINOIS

Illinois Benedictine College, 5700 College Road, Lisle, IL 60532
Project Director: Ronald J. Kovach (708) 960-1500 FAX: (708) 960-1126

Northwestern University, National High School Institute, 617 Noyes, Evanston, IL, 60208
Project Director: Lynn Goodnight (800) 662-6474 FAX: (708) 467-1057

Western Illinois University, Cross Cultural Education Programs, 5 Horrabin Hall, Macomb, IL 61455
Project Director: Carol Fimmen (309) 298-2924 FAX: (309) 298-2226

KENTUCKY

University of Louisville, Department of Political Science, Louisville, KY 40292
Project Director: Charles Ziegler (502) 852-3306 FAX: (502) 852-7923

LOUISIANA

Louisiana State University at Shreveport, College of Liberal Arts, 1 University Place, Shreveport, LA 71115
Project Director: Dr. Ann McLaurin (318) 797-5371 FAX: (318) 797-5358

MARYLAND

University of Maryland at College Park, Center for Political Leadership & Participation, College Park, MD 20742
Project Director: Kathy Kretman (301) 405-5751 FAX: (301) 405-6402

MASSACHUSETTS

Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government, 79 J.F.K. Street, Cambridge, MA 02138
Project Director: Ronald Heifetz (617) 495-7867 FAX: (617) 496-5960

MINNESOTA

University of Minnesota, Disability Services, 12 Johnston Hall, Minneapolis, MN 55455
Project Director: Betty Aune (612) 624-6884 FAX: (612) 626-9654

MISSOURI

University of Missouri System at Columbia, 529 Clark Hall, Columbia, MO 65211
Project Director: Vicky Wilson (314) 882-5859 FAX: (314) 884-4336

NEW MEXICO

Santa Fe Community College, Institute for Intercultural Community Leadership, P.O. Box 4187, Santa Fe, NM 87502-4187
Project Director: Rita Martinez-Purson
(Ron Zee, former director) (505) 438-1618 FAX: (505) 438-1289

NEW YORK

Long Island University, Southampton Campus, Southampton, NY 11968
Project Director: Alice Flynn (516) 287-8272 FAX: (516) 287-8287

Sarah Lawrence College, 1 Mead Way, Bronxville, NY 10708-5999
Project Directors: Raymond Clarke (914) 395-2343 FAX: (914) 395-2666
Charlotte A. Price (914) 395-2404

University of New York at Binghamton, Center for Leadership Studies, P.O. Box 6000, Binghamton, NY 13902
Project Director: Bruce J. Avolio (607) 777-4028 FAX: (607) 777-4188

OHIO

Marietta College, The McDonough Center for Leadership & Business, 215 N. 5th Street, Marietta, OH 45750
Project Director:
Stephen W. Schwartz (614) 396-4760 FAX: (614) 376-4763

OKLAHOMA

Oklahoma State University, 201 Whitehurst, Stillwater, OK 74078
Project Director: Stephen Haseley (405) 744-5328 FAX: (405) 744-8871

PENNSYLVANIA

Chatham College, Department of Student Affairs, Woodland Road, Pittsburgh, PA 15232
Project Director: Louise A. Caligiuri (412) 365-1286 FAX: (412) 365-1620

Gettysburg College, Leadership Development Center, Gettysburg, PA 17325
Project Director: William Rosenbach (717) 337-6486 FAX: (717) 337-6488

University of Pennsylvania, The Wharton School, Fels Building, Suite 23,
3814 Walnut Street, Philadelphia, PA 19104
Project Director: Robert J. House (215) 898-7722 FAX: (215) 573-5613

TEXAS

Texas A&M University, Department of Political Science, College Station, TX 77843-4348
Project Director: Arnold Vedlitz (409) 845-2929 FAX: (409) 847-8924
(Lyle Schoenfeldt, former co-director)

University of Texas at El Paso, 203 E. Union, El Paso, TX 79968
Project Director: Student Activities Center (915) 747-5670 FAX: (915) 747 5670
(Tom Jackson, former director)

VIRGINIA

University of Richmond, Jepson School of Leadership Studies, Richmond, VA 23173
Project Director: Howard T. Prince II (804) 289-8903 FAX: (804) 287-6062

WASHINGTON

Washington Leadership Institute, 3507 46th Avenue, NE, Seattle, WA 98105
Project Director: Stephen Boyd (206) 524-6070 FAX: (206) 523-1606

Washington State University, Department of Educational Leadership,
356 Cleveland Hall, Pullman, WA 99164-2136
Project Director: John S. Burns (509) 335-4702 FAX: (509) 335-7977

WEST VIRGINIA

West Virginia University, 2112 Agricultural Sciences Building,
P.O. Box 6214, Morgantown, WV 26506-6214
Project Director: Office of International Programs (304) 293-6955 FAX: (304) 293-6957
(Guilan Wang, former director)

WISCONSIN

St. Norbert College, F. K. Bemis International Center, 100 Grant Street, Depere, WI
54115-2099
Project Director: Stuart Lang (414) 337-3955 FAX: (414) 337-4008

PEOPLE INTERVIEWED BY THE EISENHOWER LEADERSHIP GROUP

Appendix 2

Benjamin R. Barber
Professor of Political Science, Rutgers University

Robert N. Bellah
Professor of Sociology, University of California, Berkeley

Herbert and Paula Berg
Superintendent of Schools, Alexandria, Virginia and Elementary School Teacher in Fairfax, Virginia Public Schools

Robert Dahl
Professor Emeritus, Political Science, Yale University

James Greenberg
Center for Teaching Excellence, University of Maryland

Daniel Kemmis
Mayor of Missoula, Montana

Frances Moore Lappé
Co-Director, Center for Living Democracy

Charles Lindblom
Professor Emeritus, Political Science, Yale University

Glenn Loury
Professor of Economics, Boston University

Bernard Oliver
Dean of the College of Education, Washington State University

Neil Postman
University Professor, New York University

Robert Putnam
Professor of Government, Harvard University

Eric Schaps
President, Developmental Studies Center, Oakland, California

Earl Smith
Dean of Social Sciences, Pacific Lutheran University

Rogers Smith
Professor of Political Science, Yale University

Paul Vance
Superintendent of Schools, Montgomery County, Maryland

Ronald Walters
Professor of Political Science, Howard University

Sean Wilentz
Professor of History, Princeton University

SUGGESTED READINGS

Appendix 3

Democracy At Risk

Robert N. Bellah, Richard Madsen, William M. Sullivan, Ann Swidler, and Steven M. Tipton, *Habits of the Heart: Individualism and Commitment in American Life* (University of California Press, 1985). University of California Professor Bellah and his colleagues weigh the balance between individualism and community based on interviews with hundreds of American citizens.

Jean Bethke Elshtain, *Democracy on Trial* (BasicBooks, 1995). Elshtain urges citizens to rise above the mire of single issue activism to work together to address our common challenges.

Daniel Kemmis, *The Good City and the Good Life: Renewing the Sense of Community* (Houghton Mifflin Company, 1995). An elected official's thoughtful comments on the nature of citizenship and political responsibility.

Charles F. Kettering Foundation, *Kettering Review* (Fall 1995). A collection of articles about the state of democracy in the United States by scholars from various disciplines.

Frances Moore Lappé and Paul Martin DuBois, *The Quickening of America: Rebuilding Our Nation, Remaking Our Lives* (Jossey-Bass, 1994). Stories of everyday Americans tackling their toughest problems -- in their communities, schools, workplaces, and lives.

John McKnight, *The Careless Society: Community and Its Counterfeits* (BasicBooks, 1995). Northwestern University Professor McKnight argues that the community capacity of local citizens is the basis for resolving many of America's social problems.

Robert D. Putnam, *Making Democracy Work: Civic Traditions in Modern Italy* (Princeton University Press, 1993). Harvard University Professor Putnam and his colleagues offer empirical evidence for the importance of strong civic communities in developing successful economies based on two decades of study of Italian politics.

Michael W. Salvador and Patricia M. Sias, editors, *The Public Voice in a Democracy at Risk: Preparing Citizen Leaders for the 21st Century* (Murrow School of Communications, Washington State University, forthcoming September 1996). A collection of essays regarding the impact of the mass media on America's "public voice" with suggestions for educating participatory citizen leaders in K-16 education.

Leadership

James MacGregor Burns, *Leadership* (Harper & Row, 1978). The most comprehensive work on the leadership topic to date by a Pulitzer Prize-winning historian and political scientist.

David D. Chrislip and Carl E. Larson, *Collaborative Leadership: How Citizens and Civic Leaders Can Make a Difference* (Jossey-Bass, 1994). The authors argue that working together successfully today requires a shift in our conception of how change is created, and an equally profound shift in our concept of leadership.

John W. Gardner, *On Leadership* (The Free-Press, 1990). Gardner explains that the complexity of the large-scale systems that dominate modern society make it essential that initiative and responsibility be widely dispersed so that many individuals at all levels are ready and willing to take leadership to make their part of the system work.

Ronald A. Heifetz, *Leadership Without Easy Answers* (Harvard University Press, 1994). Heifetz lays out a practical and pathbreaking set of strategies for leadership in an age without easy answers.

Larraine R. Matusak, *Finding Your Voice: Learning to Lead... Anywhere You Want to Make a Difference* (Jossey-Bass, forthcoming Fall of 1996). A leadership book for those without leadership titles who are making a difference. Matusak offers sound advice to "regular people" on topics from risk-taking to appreciating diversity.

Barbara Kellerman, editor, *Political Leadership: A Source Book* (University of Pittsburgh Press, 1986). A superbly chosen and organized collection of readings on political leadership.

Joseph C. Rost, *Leadership for the Twenty-first Century* (Praeger Publishers, 1991). University of San Diego Professor Rost critiques the efforts of scholars and practitioners to understand leadership based on the values of the industrial paradigm and helps the reader toward a new model for the twenty-first century.

Role of Education

Alexander W. Astin and Helen S. Astin, *A Social Change Model of Leadership Development Guidebook: Version II* (Higher Education Research Institute, University of California, Los Angeles, 1995). The authors provide an innovative leadership model for the higher education community. Their ultimate aim is "to prepare a new generation of leaders who understand that they can act as leaders to effect change without necessarily being in traditional leadership positions of power and authority."

Benjamin Barber, *An Aristocracy of Everyone: The Politics of Education and the Future of America* (Ballantine Books, 1992). Rutgers University Professor Barber argues: "There is only one road to democracy: education. And in a democracy, there is only one essential task for the educator: teaching liberty."

Ernest L. Boyer, *The Basic School: A Community of Learning* (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1995). The late president of the Carnegie Foundation and his colleagues offer a new vision of elementary education: "An effective school connects people, to create community; curriculum, to achieve coherence; classrooms and resources, to enrich the climate; and learning to life, to build character."

Ernest L. Boyer, *Scholarship Reconsidered: Priorities of the Professoriate* (The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990). Boyer criticizes today's educational institutions as stagnant and overly focused on external activities of research and publications. Teachers and faculty must reconsider the meaning of scholarship -- discovery, integration, application, and teaching.

Campus Life: In Search of Community (Special Report of The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1990). As our schools and campuses are becoming increasingly diverse, educators and students face the challenge of finding community. The report proposes six principles "to strengthen the spirit of community" in schools and on campuses -- a purposeful community, an open community, a just community, a disciplined community, a caring community, and a celebrative community.

CivicQuest, *Learning Leadership: A Curriculum Guide for a New Generation* (Center for Political Leadership & Participation, University of Maryland, forthcoming September 1996). Faculty from the University of Maryland and the John F. Kennedy High School have worked together for two years to create this leadership curriculum source book aimed primarily at secondary schools with instructional materials applicable to elementary and middle schools.

Gary M. Crow and Robert O. Slater, *Educating Democracy: The Role of Systemic Leadership* (National Policy Board for Educational Administration, 1996). This monograph written for the National Policy Board for Educational Administration discusses the pitfalls of democracy and suggests how systemic democratic leadership will help us to avoid these pitfalls.

Roger Soder, editor, *Democracy, Education, and the Schools* (Jossey-Bass, 1996). Soder, his colleagues at the Center for Educational Renewal at the University of Washington, and other scholars argue that teaching children the moral and intellectual responsibilities of living and working in a democracy is the most basic purpose of America's schools.

DEMOCRACY AT RISK:
How Schools Can Lead

Eisenhower Leadership Group

Center for Political Leadership & Participation
University of Maryland

Leadership Education Project
John F. Kennedy School of Government
Harvard University

Department of Educational Leadership and Counseling Psychology
Washington State University

For information or to obtain additional copies of this report, please contact:

The Center for Political Leadership & Participation
The University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742-7715
phone: 301/405-5751
fax: 301/405-6402
cplp@umail.umd.edu

Copyright © 1996

This project was supported by a grant from the U.S. Department of Education.